

1
2
3
4
5
6
7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
8 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
9

10 -----oo0oo-----
11

12 DAVID M. FRIEDMAN et al.,
13 On behalf of all others
14 similarly situated,
15 Plaintiffs,

16 NO. CIV. 2:00-101 WBS DAD
17

18 ORDER
19

20 v.
21

22 CALIFORNIA STATE EMPLOYEES
23 ASSOCIATION, et al.,
24

25 Defendants.
26

27

28 -----oo0oo-----
29

30 The court has received and considered the parties'
31 stipulation and proposed order regarding plaintiff's motion for
32 approval of class notice of motion for award of attorneys' fees,
33 together with defendants' Notices of Non-Opposition (Docket Nos.
34 278, 284-86). The court has the following concerns:

35 1. The proposed class notice (Docket No. 278) states
36 that objections to the motion for attorneys' fees
37 should be "postmarked no later than **July 2, 2010**" (Id.
38 3:24) and that the objections must also be "received by
39 Class Counsel on or before July 2, 2010." (Id. 4:2.)

The identical "postmarked by" and "received by" requirements create ambiguity as to what an objecting class member's responsibility is with respect to timely objection.

2. Page 2, line 22 of the proposed class notice should be corrected to "Federal Rule of Civil Procedure."

3. The court would like to have a supporting declaration by a competent official that states the date by which the class notice and disbursement of nominal damages will be mailed to class members.

Accordingly, within twenty days from the date of this Order, the parties shall submit proposed class notice and supporting declaration modified to address the above concerns.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: April 20, 2010

William W. Shubbe

WILLIAM B. SHUBB
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE